

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

By this Amendment, Applicants add new claim 34. Accordingly, claims 5, 9, 11-13, 16-18 and 23-34 remain pending in the application.

**THE EXAMINER IS ONCE AGAIN RESPECTFULLY REQUESTED TO
STATE WHETHER THE DRAWINGS ARE ACCEPTABLE.**

The FINALITY of the Office Action dated 25 September 2007 is respectfully requested to be withdrawn, and reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the following Remarks.

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FINALITY OF OFFICE ACTION

M.P.E.P. § 706.07 provides that:

"a second or any subsequent action on the merits in any application or patent undergoing reexamination proceedings will not be made final if it includes a rejection, on newly cited art, other than information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17 (p), of any claim not amended by applicant or patent owner in spite of the fact that other claims may have been amended to require newly cited art."

In the Amendment filed on 7 August 2007, Applicants did not amend claim 9.

For the first time, the FINAL Office Action dated 25 September 2007 rejects claim 9 as allegedly being unpatentable over Liu et al. U.S. Patent 5,363,287 ("Liu") in view of Raets U.S. Patent 5,777,859 ("Raets").

No such basis for a rejection of claim 9 appeared in the previous Office Actions in this case.

This is a new ground for rejection of claim 9. This new ground for rejection was absolutely not necessitated by any amendment to claim 9, since claim 9 was not amended.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the “FINALITY” of the Office Action dated 25 September 2007 is improper.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the holding of FINALITY of the Office Action dated 25 September 2007.

35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects: claims 5, 9, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Liu et al. U.S. Patent 5,363,287 (“Liu”) in view of Raets U.S. Patent 5,777,859 (“Raets”); and claims 11-13, 167-18, 23-30 and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Liu in view of Raets and further in view of Steigerwald et al. U.S. Patent 4,695,934 (“Steigerwald”) and further in view of Marson et al. U.S. Patent 5,077,486 (“Marson”).

Applicants respectfully traverse all of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 5

Among other things, the resonant converter of claim 5 includes an inverter in series with a capacitive element, an external inductive element, and the primary winding of the transformer.

The Office Action fairly admits that Liu does not disclose such an arrangement. However, the Office Action states that Raets discloses such an arrangement, and that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liu to include Raets’ arrangement.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to provide a reason for changing Liu’s resonant converter to include the arrangement discloses by Rates. Indeed, Applicants respectfully submit that such a modification of Liu’s device would be improper. The principal object of Liu’s invention is to achieve a reduction in radiated EMI (see, e.g., Abstract; col. 1, lines 8-67) On the other hand, it seems that replacing Liu’s combination of gate filter 30, switching circuit 20, capacitor 26 and inductor 18 with Raets’ arrangement with its multiple

switching devices would necessarily increase the radiated EMI. Thus, the proposed combination would destroy Liu's object and therefore would never have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 9

Among other things, in the resonant converter of claim 9 different ratios of a magnitude of output voltage to number of turns are provided in respect of associated secondary windings having different winding directions.

Applicants respectfully submit neither Liu nor Raets discloses any resonant converter including such a combination of features. In that regard, it is noted that the magnitude of -12 volts is the same as the magnitude of +12 volts.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 31

Among other things, the resonant converter of claim 31 includes a regulating circuit for deriving from each of the multiple outputs a measuring signal for regulating an output voltage of the inverter.

Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of the cited art would produce a resonant converter including such a feature.

Applicants respectfully submit that Liu and Raets do not disclose such a feature.

Furthermore, the Office Action does not allege that Liu or Raets or any combination thereof discloses such a feature. Indeed, the Office Action does not even mention this feature!

Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 31 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 11-13, 16-18, 23-30 and 32-33

Claims 11-13, 16-18, 23-30 and 32-33 depend variously from claims 5-9.

Applicants respectfully submit that the addition and combination of Steigerwald and Marson do not remedy the shortcomings of Liu and Raets as set forth above with respect to claims 5 and 9.

Furthermore, the Office Action does not cite any reason why it would be believed that “*utilizing the technique taught by Steigerwald et al. and Marson et al.*” would possibly “*increas[e] the efficiency of the power, reduc[e] cost and increas[e] availability.*”

So the proposed combination is respectfully traversed.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-13, 16-18, 23-30, and 32-33 are patentable over the cited art.

NEW CLAIM 34

New claims 34 depends from claim 5 and is deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 5. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art does not disclose any arrangement that includes a half-bridge drive circuit adapted to receive a signal from a regulating circuit and in response thereto to provide first and second control signals for switching first and second switching elements of the inverter.

DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

Applicants note that the previously-issued Double Patenting rejection has not been included in the FINAL Office Action and is therefore deemed to be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 5, 9, 11-13, 16-18 and 23-34 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (571) 283.0720 to discuss these

matters.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE & WHITT



By:

Kenneth D. Springer
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE & WHITT
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260
Reston, Virginia 20190
Telephone No.: (571) 283.0724
Facsimile No.: (571) 283.0740